

in the building that once housed the Wilmington Morning Star, his first job as a reporter. However, when considering Professor Myers' story, it seems fitting that someone with the character, work ethic, and servant's approach to life will be returning to the building of his first post-college job wearing the robe of a Federal judge. I have faith in Professor Myers' ability to do the right thing every day in this critically important role, and I am grateful for the opportunity to speak on his behalf to our colleagues. This is well-deserving, and he will be an incredibly effective serving judge in our district court system. I urge my colleagues to support him unanimously.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Myers nomination?

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 383 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Cassidy	Enzi
Barrasso	Collins	Ernst
Blackburn	Coons	Feinstein
Blunt	Cornyn	Fischer
Boozman	Cotton	Gardner
Braun	Cramer	Graham
Burr	Crapo	Grassley
Capito	Cruz	Hassan
Cardin	Daines	Hawley
Carper	Duckworth	Hoeven
Casey	Durbin	Hyde-Smith

Inhofe	Murphy	Shaheen
Johnson	Peters	Shelby
Jones	Portman	Sinema
Kaine	Reed	Sullivan
Kennedy	Risch	Tester
King	Roberts	Thune
Lankford	Romney	Tillis
Leahy	Rosen	Toomey
Lee	Rubio	Warner
Manchin	Sasse	Wicker
McConnell	Scott (FL)	Young
McSally	Scott (SC)	

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Heinrich	Schumer
Bennet	Hirono	Smith
Blumenthal	Markey	Stabenow
Brown	Menendez	Udall
Cantwell	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Schatz	Wyden

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Moran	Rounds
Harris	Murkowski	Sanders
Isakson	Paul	Warren
Klobuchar	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lydon nomination, Calendar No. 489, be made pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Sherri A. Lydon, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Lydon nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 384 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Feinstein	Reed
Baldwin	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Gardner	Roberts
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Blunt	Grassley	Rosen
Boozman	Hassan	Rubio
Braun	Hawley	Sasse
Burr	Heinrich	Scott (FL)
Capito	Hoeven	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Shaheen
Carper	Inhofe	Shelby
Casey	Johnson	Sinema
Cassidy	Jones	Stabenow
Collins	Kaine	Sullivan
Coons	Kennedy	Tester
Cornyn	King	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Leahy	Toomey
Cramer	Lee	Udall
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Whitehouse
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Duckworth	Menendez	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	Young
Enzi	Peters	
Ernst	Portman	

NAYS—13

Bennet	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	Markey	Smith
Brown	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Murray	
Gillibrand	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Moran	Rounds
Harris	Murkowski	Sanders
Isakson	Paul	Warren
Klobuchar	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Duncan nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2025. (Reappointment)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 150

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor again to seek unanimous consent for a resolution that commemorates the Armenian genocide.

In October, the House of Representatives passed a version of this resolution by a vote of 405 to 11—405 to 11. This vote was historic, and I applaud the bipartisan courage of those in the House to stand up for what is right.

For those here in the Senate who would consider objecting to this request, I urge you to think long and hard about what it means for your reputation, what it means for history, and what it means for the Senate as an institution. History is watching, and it will not look kindly on those who object to recognizing genocide.

In recent speeches before the Senate, I have laid out the case for why we must move forward on this resolution.

The simple threshold question for this body comes to this: Do we recognize a clear case of genocide when it happens, or do we let a country like Turkey determine our own views, determine our own sense of history, determine our own moral obligation, and determine the public record—a Turkey that today is committing atrocities against the Kurds in Syria, a Turkey that has teamed up with Russia and the Kremlin in purchasing the S-400 air defense system and just recently used it against an American F-16 to see if it works, and a Turkey that works to block forward movement in NATO on key national security objectives of the United States?

At what point do we say enough is enough? At what point do we simply move forward and acknowledge the truth? The truth is that the Armenian genocide happened. It is a fact. To deny that is to deny one of the monstrous acts of history. This denial is a stain on the Senate and our country. We have an opportunity to right that wrong and put the U.S. Senate on the right side of history.

Let's again review some of that history here today. More than 104 years ago, the Ottoman Empire launched a systemic campaign to exterminate the Armenian population through killings, forced deportations, starvation, and other brutal matters. How do we know this? How do we know this? Because U.S. diplomats were there. They wrote it down and sent it back to the State Department in Washington.

Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire from 1913 to 1916, wrote this in his memoir:

When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal this fact. . . . I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

That is what Henry Morgenthau said. On June 5, 1915, the U.S. consul in Aleppo, Jesse Jackson, wrote to Ambassador Morgenthau, saying:

There is a living stream of Armenians pouring into Aleppo from the surrounding towns and villages.

The [Ottoman] Government has been appealed to by various prominent people and even by those in authority to put an end to these conditions, under the representations that it can only lead to the greatest blame and reproach, but all to no avail. It is without doubt a carefully planned scheme to thoroughly extinguish the Armenian race.

On July 24, 1915, in a report to Ambassador Morgenthau, the U.S. consul in Harput, Leslie Davis, stated: "Any doubt that may have been expressed in previous reports as to the Government's intention in sending away the Armenians have been removed. . . . It has been no secret that the plan was to destroy the Armenian race as a race. . . . Everything was apparently planned months ago.

In an October 1, 1916 telegram to Secretary of State Robert Lansing, U.S. Charge d'Affaires Hoffman Philip wrote, "The Department is in receipt of ample details demonstrating the horrors of the anti-Armenian campaign. For many months past I have felt that the most efficacious method of dealing with the situation from an international standpoint would be to flatly threaten to withdraw our Diplomatic Representative from a country where such barbarous methods are not only tolerated but actually carried out by order of the existing government."

And finally, Abram I. Elkus, who served as the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire from 1916-17, telegraphed the Secretary of State on October 17, 1916, stating "In order to avoid opprobrium of the civilized world, which the continuation of massacres [of the Armenians] would arouse, Turkish officials have now adopted and are executing the unchecked policy of extermination through starvation, exhaustion, and brutality of treatment hardly surpassed even in Turkish history."

That continues to verify that these diplomats saw the truth with their own eyes and communicated back to their superiors in Washington. They did their job, and the historical record proves it. Now it is up to individual U.S. Senators to do your job.

The Government of Turkey has funded lobbyists willing to trumpet lies and make excuses for these atrocities. The Turkish Government and its sympathizers have advocated for restrictive laws on expression and against legislation that recognizes the Armenian genocide. They will stop at nothing to bury the truth. I hope that individual Senators will not once again fall for it.

Any apprehension, any trepidation on the part of Senators who believe this resolution will somehow do irreparable harm to our relationship with Turkey is simply unfounded. Twenty-seven countries have recognized the genocide in one form or another. Some saw trade increases in Turkey following their recognition. Twelve members of NATO have recognized the genocide. They still work with Turkey on defense issues. They still have embassies in Ankara. Their relationships were not irreparably harmed. Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, and the Slovak Republic all did the right thing.

I say to my friends and colleagues that genocide is genocide. Senators in this body should have the simple courage to say it plainly, say it clearly, and say it without reservation.

In every session of Congress since 2006, I have introduced or cosponsored resolutions affirming the facts of the Armenian genocide. When I was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I was proud to preside over the passage of an Armenian genocide resolution out of the committee.

The work continues here today. If we are not successful this afternoon, I know we are not going to stop until we are. I am not going to stop until I go through every single Senator who is willing to come to the floor and issue an objection on behalf of the administration because I think Armenian Americans need to know who stands in support of recognizing the genocide and who opposes it.

I thank Senator CRUZ for joining me in this effort. He has been stalwart with me in this bipartisan resolution. I thank the 27 additional Senators who have been willing to stand up for a true, clear-eyed vision: Senators VAN HOLLEN, RUBIO, STABENOW, GARDNER, MARKEY, CORNYN, WARREN, ROMNEY, PETERS, PORTMAN, FEINSTEIN, WYDEN, DUCKWORTH, REED, SCHUMER, UDALL, HARRIS, WHITEHOUSE, SANDERS, KLOBUCHAR, CARDIN, BOOKER, CASEY, BENNET, ROSEN, BROWN, and CORTEZ MASTO. I thank them all.

Before I ask unanimous consent, I yield to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am proud to join with my colleague from New Jersey today in urging the Senate to take up and pass the bipartisan Menendez-Cruz resolution affirming U.S. recognition of the Armenian genocide.

From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire carried out a forced deportation of nearly 2 million Armenians, of whom 1.5 million were killed. It was an atrocious genocide. That it happened is a fact and an undeniable reality. In fact, the very word "genocide," which literally means the killing of an entire people, was coined by Raphael Lemkin to describe the horrific nature of the Ottoman Empire's calculated extermination of the Armenians.

We must never be silenced in response to atrocities. Over 100 years ago, the world was silent as the Armenian people suffered and were murdered, and many people today are still unaware of what happened.

With this resolution, we are saying that it is the policy of the United States of America to commemorate the Armenian genocide through official recognition and remembrance. We have a moral duty to acknowledge what happened to 1.5 million innocent souls. It is the right thing to do.

I certainly understand the concerns of some of my colleagues who worry that this resolution could irreversibly poison the U.S.-Turkey relationship and push Turkey into the arms of Russia, but I don't believe those concerns have any sound basis.

As my colleague from New Jersey pointed out, 12 NATO nations have similarly recognized the Armenian genocide. Yes, Turkey is a NATO ally, but allies can speak the truth to each other. We should never be afraid to tell the truth, and alliances grounded in lies are themselves unsustainable. Additionally, in the coming days, the Foreign Relations Committee will be

marking up an enormous package of sanctions on Turkey.

The horse has left the barn. There is no good reason for the administration to object to this resolution, and the effect of doing so is to deny recognition of this chilling moment of history.

Let me close by echoing the optimism the Senator from New Jersey expressed. We may well see an objection here today, as we did when Senator MENENDEZ and I previously came to the Senate floor and sought to pass this just a couple of weeks ago, but I believe that in the coming days and weeks, we will get this passed and that this objection, I hope, will be only temporary. I look forward to the day—hopefully very, very soon—when all 100 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, are united in simply speaking the truth, recognizing the genocide that occurred, and making perfectly clear that America stands against genocide.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Texas for his eloquent statement and for his forthrightness on this issue.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 150 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I don't think there is a single Member of the U.S. Senate who doesn't have serious concerns about Turkey's behavior both historically and currently. In fact, I support the spirit of this resolution. I suspect 99 of my colleagues do. At the right time, we may pass it, as Senator CRUZ has stated; however, I don't think this is the right time. If there is a right time, this certainly isn't it. It is largely because just hours ago, our President returned from the NATO summit in London with NATO leaders, where this was a topic of discussion with the leadership from Turkey—this being the acknowledgement of genocide, as well as the purchase of the S-400.

I want to have a clear readout of the President's interaction and discussion with President Erdogan and our delegation's negotiations with Turkey before adopting this resolution. I don't think we can take the risk of undermining the complex and ongoing diplomatic efforts which are in our national security interests as a country.

I, too, want to be on the right side of history. I believe we will be on the right side of history, but these negotia-

tions that the President is currently in are a part of getting on the right side of history.

I appreciate the ongoing conversations and still hope we will be able to overcome the challenges in the bilateral relationship with Turkey. We know what these challenges are, and we all share the goal of seeing them appropriately addressed, but there is no good alternative right now. In my view, adoption of this resolution today is unnecessary and might very well undermine that diplomatic effort at a key time.

I do not intend to continuously object to this resolution, but I believe it is appropriate for me to do so at this time, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, once again, I am deeply disappointed. This is the third time a Republican Senator has come to the floor to object to the genocide resolution—the recognition of the genocide resolution. There is never a good time. There is never a good time. In my view, there is always the right time, however, to recognize genocide as genocide.

My colleague from North Dakota actually sponsored H. Res. 220, the Armenian genocide resolution, affirming “the proper commemoration and consistent condemnation of the Armenian Genocide will strengthen our international standing in preventing modern-day genocides” when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. He was right then. He was right then. The time was right then, and the time is right now.

President Erdogan was here in the United States a couple of weeks ago. There was a meeting at the White House. A few of my colleagues had the privilege of joining the President expressing their discontent. Erdogan was given options—a way out of the dilemma that Turkey has put themselves in with the S-400. Basically, they were told either return to Russia and destroy them in our presence and/or give them to us, which, of course, Russia will never allow that to happen, for us to have their technology.

There was a deadline. It was yesterday. I waited until today to make sure that in fact we wouldn't intercede in any way with that possibility. Turkey, in the interim, while this is going on, they used the S-400 to fire at an F-16 to see if they could take it down. Really? Really?

So this premise that there was a meeting in NATO—well, there was a meeting in Washington, and then there was a meeting in NATO. They still haven't done anything on the S-400. They still haven't exercised any of the options that have been given to them.

I just want my colleagues to know that I intend to come once a week to the Senate floor, and all those who want to be listed on the wrong side of history, they have the option of doing

so. I am not going to cease until we do what is morally and principally right, and that is to recognize the Armenian genocide as a host of other nations have done as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee, as a member of the Bar Association of Delaware, and a Member of the U.S. Senate. I am concerned about the transformation of our Federal judiciary under this current administration. I am particularly concerned about rising issues around qualification and competency. Let me speak to that, if I might, for a few minutes.

This Senate is doing precious little in terms of legislating, but we are moving at a breakneck pace to confirm President Trump's judicial nominees—roughly, 150 so far. During the entire 8 years of the previous administration, 55 circuit court judges were confirmed. Nearly that same number have been confirmed in just 3 years of the Trump administration—48. Nearly one in seven of all U.S. district court judges currently serving have been appointed by President Trump.

I am deeply concerned about the quality of some of these nominations. Some have never taken a deposition, argued a motion, let alone tried a case in court. The American Bar Association, the professional association of lawyers, has ranked nine of President Trump's nominees as “not qualified,” which is an exceptionally unusual and striking step for them to take.

This isn't about whether the President's nominees are conservative or not. I understand that elections have consequences and that a Republican President will more often than not nominate conservative judges. I have, in some cases, joined my Democratic colleagues in supporting qualified nominees put forward by the administration who have won support from their home State Senators and advanced through a bipartisan judicial nomination and confirmation process in our committee, but let's be clear. I will not stand by while this administration rams through nominees who are not just Republican and not just conservative but demonstrably unqualified.

I can't support nominees with deeply concerning records about their commitment to justice and to advancing a commonsense jurisprudence. I am not going to set a standard any lower than what has been required in previous administrations to serve on the Federal bench for many, many years.

We have heard in this Chamber and around this country that the quality of the Federal bench and the capabilities and the experience and the values and the judgment of those who serve on Federal benches across this country is an absolutely essential piece of our Constitution and our ordered liberty.

The cases that come before Federal courts are too important to tolerate incompetence, inexperience, or bias in the Federal judiciary.

Why does this matter both in terms of the process and the substance? The President has put forward nominees who, in my view, would take us backward on civil rights and voting rights, on women's access to healthcare, on laws that protect consumers and workers, and on the environment. Their decisions impact every American. Equally concerning is that Trump's nominees don't reflect the diversity of our Nation. We want litigants to go into a court and be able to have their day in court and be confident that the judge before them represents the breadth and range of America.

So far, of the 55 circuit court nominees confirmed, only 11 have been women, and they have been even less racially diverse. Of all of President Trump's nominees, 87 percent are White and 78 percent are men. I think the judiciary should reflect the diversity of the American people and have strong records and a wealth of experience. Sadly, that is not the case for several we have considered, and let me briefly speak to two.

President Trump's nominee to serve on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, who was recently confirmed, Lawrence VanDyke, raised serious concerns about his work ethic and his temperament. He was rated "not qualified" by the ABA based on concerns about his lack of knowledge of basic procedural rules and his commitment to being truthful. Six retired justices of the Montana Supreme Court questioned his fitness when he ran for the Supreme Court in Montana and expressed concerns about his partisanship and the possibility of corporate influence. He is opposed to basic civil rights and civil liberties for the LGBTQ community and made a range of statements that I think would be disqualifying under any circumstance.

Sarah Pitlyk, who this Senate just confirmed this week to a lifetime seat on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, has never tried a case, either criminal or civil, has never taken a deposition, has never examined a witness, and has never argued a motion in Federal or State court. The ABA unanimously rated her as "unqualified" for a lifetime seat in the Federal judiciary.

We can and we should do better than this. Of the entire bar of the State of Missouri, I am certain there are qualified, capable, and seasoned conservatives who could have been nominated for that seat in the entire Ninth Circuit. In particular, the State for which Mr. VanDyke was nominated, there are certainly abundant opportunities to choose qualified nominees. We can and we should do better than this.

In my State of Delaware, my senior Senator, TOM CARPER, and I worked together to help form a bipartisan judicial nominating committee to fill two

vacancies on our district court. We felt strongly we had to reach out to the White House and work with them to identify consensus nominees who would be the best candidates we could best support and whom the President could nominate. Ultimately, we had a very productive process, and the President nominated Maryellen Noreika and Colm Connolly, whom we both returned positive blue slips for. They ultimately have been confirmed by this Senate, seated, and now serve in our district court. This is how the process should work.

We should be able to consult back and forth between the executive and legislative until we find competent, capable, and qualified judges of whom we can all be proud of. The Senate should not be a rubberstamp for this administration, regardless of the quality of nominees that get sent forward.

I will continue to oppose President Trump's nominees who are undeserving of a seat on the Federal bench and unqualified to serve. It is, in my view, our responsibility to guard against the politicization of the Federal judiciary, and we should work together, not to tear down and destroy the traditions and rules of this Senate but to find ways to strengthen and sustain them. That is how we will move qualified and consensus nominees forward and protect the independent judiciary on which our very democracy rests.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY ISAKSON

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today because I missed an important occasion in the Senate. We had a celebration recently of one of our more beloved Members, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON of Georgia.

There wasn't much that could keep me away from that, but there was no Senator going to Madrid to the conference of the parties to consider the Paris Climate Agreement. Speaker PELOSI asked me to come on her House delegation so that it was bicameral. As I think most people in this body know, I am pretty animated on that subject and couldn't say no. There are not many other things that could have kept me away.

I want to come now and make up a little bit for being absent that day and express my gratitude for JOHNNY's friendship to me over the years. I had the pleasure of going with him to the D-day anniversary on a codel that he led with his usual graciousness and patriotism. He was kind enough to join quite early on the bipartisan Senate Oceans Caucus I started and has been a very helpful part of that endeavor.

We have worked together on ways to improve healthcare planning for people who are in the late stage of illness to make sure that they get the care that they want and don't get a lot of care that they don't want and so that they have a chance to have their dignity and desire to be at home respected.

We have long been adherent of a biennial budget, and I am delighted that the bipartisan bill that Senator ENZI and I have put together will create a biennial budget. I am not sure we will be able to get that done before Senator ISAKSON leaves, but one way or the other, his interest in biennial budgeting will live on, I hope, successfully when we pass that.

We had a parity question about children's mental health hospitals that weren't getting counted and, therefore, weren't getting access to funding for the medical interns who come, and JOHNNY helped me fix that. It helped, I am sure, hospitals in Georgia, but it was particularly helpful to me for our Children's Hospital in Rhode Island.

We have a lot of Rhode Islanders who were killed in the Lebanon Marine barracks bombing, and there has been litigation against Iran for its responsibility for those deaths. It is not easy to collect a judgment on a foreign government, and JOHNNY has been very helpful to me in our joint efforts on Iran terror victims' judgments, helping us let the lawyers collect against assets of the Government of Iran.

Then, we regularly have done National Mentoring Month resolutions together.

But for all the things we have done together, that is not what I am going to miss about Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON. He is just one of the most decent, kind, good people who I have come across anywhere in my life and, certainly, one of the most decent and kind Members of the Senate.

With my very sincere apologies, JOHNNY, for missing the correct day, I hope you will understand how much it mattered to me to be elsewhere and why I had to be there. I come to the floor now, belatedly, to wish you all my very best with great affection and great respect.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the soon-to-be-pending nomination be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Duncan nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 385 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Feinstein	Portman
Baldwin	Fischer	Reed
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Bennet	Gillibrand	Roberts
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Blumenthal	Grassley	Rosen
Blunt	Hassan	Rubio
Boozman	Hawley	Sasse
Braun	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Burr	Hoeben	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Capito	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cardin	Johnson	Shelby
Carper	Jones	Sinema
Casey	Kaine	Smith
Cassidy	Kennedy	Stabenow
Collins	King	Sullivan
Coons	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Cramer	Markey	Udall
Crapo	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cruz	McSally	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Merkley	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Enzi	Murray	Young
Ernst	Peters	

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Moran	Rounds
Harris	Murkowski	Sanders
Isakson	Paul	Warren
Klobuchar	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 533.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk read the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Jerry Moran, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Mike Braun, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 534.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Jerry Moran, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Mike Braun, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 530.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roger F. Wicker, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Mike Braun, Shelley Moore Capito.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 543.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.